

Interview Summary	Application No. 09/502,133	Applicant(s) HELSO, HAROLD E.
	Examiner Hugh Jones	Art Unit 2128

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Hugh Jones. (3) Mary J. Edwards.
 (2) Kamini Shah (SPE). (4) Dr. Harold Helson.

Date of Interview: 22 July 2008.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
 c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.
 If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: the inventor's Ph D thesis.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: tentative agreement was reached on proposed claim language, namely expressing the identified symmetry. Applicant's Representative and the inventor are thanked for their detailed arguments and explanations regarding the differences between the applied art and the claimed invention. Proposed claim language to traverse 101 issues was also discussed.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Hugh Jones/
 Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2128